

REMARKS

Applicant has amended the cross reference to Related Applications to properly reflect the issued U.S. Patents that correspond to the referenced patent applications. Applicant submits that no new matter was introduced.

The Office Action objected to claims 1, 9, 15 and 22.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Athanas et al. (US Patent 5,828,858).

With regard to the objection to claims 1, 9, 15 and 22, applicant respectfully traverses. Without citing any authority, the Office Action stated that claims 1 and 9 are objected to because the recitation of "a fabric interconnect" is not clear as to what applicant intends to mean. Similarly, and again without citing any authority, the Office Action stated that claims 15 and 22 are objected to because the recitation of "a fabric" is not clear as to what applicant intends to mean. Applicant respectfully traverses and requests that the objections be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that the terms "fabric" and "fabric interconnect" would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was filed. See for example, <http://www.linktionary.com/f/fabric.html>, which describes "fabric [switched]" as:

Think of a multiconnection device in which a mesh of interconnections connects inputs on one side with outputs on the other side. Any input can be switched to any output almost instantaneously. This is a switching fabric. Now reduce it down to fit on a thumbnail-size (or smaller) chip. Switching fabrics allow fast internetwork connections between devices in LAN environments, on network backbones, or in Internet core networks.

Moreover, applicant discusses fabric throughout the application.

See, for example, paragraph [0024] which states:

When a collection of electronic resources including digital circuits, processors, and analog circuits is integrated by means of an interconnection network with regular or partially regular structure it is termed a fabric.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Athanas et al. (US Patent 5,828,858). Again applicant respectfully traverses.

In order for claims to be anticipated under 35 USC 102, every element of the claim must be taught by the reference (see, e.g., MPEP 2131). After a careful reading of Athanas, applicant disagrees with the characterization and mapping of the elements of Athanas in the office action to Applicant's claims.

As best understood by applicant, the office action appears to be equating applicant's claimed reconfigurable core to barrel shifter 53/output delays (56, 57) of Athanas, see, e.g., Office Action page 2, last line to page 3, line 1. Yet, Athanas clearly states at col. 8, line 9, that the IFU mesh 33 is the reconfigurable core of the device. Simply comparing IFU mesh 33 in fig. 4 of Athanas with barrel shifter 53/output delays (56, 57) of IFU 41 in Fig. 5 of Athanas, shows that the device taught by Athanas could not possibly have the topology set forth in the Applicant's independent of dependent claims, and hence Athanas does not anticipate applicant's application as claimed.

Moreover, applicant submits that the topology taught by Athanas teaches away from that claimed by applicant.

For at least these reasons, applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1-25 under 35 USC 102 be withdrawn.

Please enter the amendment and permit the application to advance to Issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christopher L. Hamlin



by Timothy R. Croll

Reg. No. 36,771

(408) 433-7625

LSI LOGIC CORPORATION

1621 Barber Lane, M/S D-106

August 8, 2005